

ALMOST EVERYWHERE CONVERGENCE AND POLYNOMIALS

MICHAEL BOSHERNITZAN AND MÁTÉ WIERDL

ABSTRACT. Denote by Γ the set of pointwise good sequences. Those are sequences of real numbers (a_k) such that for any measure preserving flow $(U_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on a probability space and for any $f \in L^\infty$, the averages $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(U_{a_k} x)$ converge almost everywhere.

We prove the following two results.

- (1) If $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and if $(f(ku + v))_{k \geq 1} \in \Gamma$ for all $u, v > 0$, then f is a polynomial on some subinterval $J \subset (0, \infty)$ of positive length.
- (2) If $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is real analytic and if $(f(ku))_{k \geq 1} \in \Gamma$ for all $u > 0$, then f is a polynomial on the whole domain $[0, \infty)$.

These results can be viewed as converses of Bourgain's polynomial ergodic theorem which claims that every polynomial sequence lies in Γ .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Proof of Theorem A	2
3. Proof of Theorem B	3
4. Proof of Proposition 3.3; smooth case	5
5. Proof of Proposition 3.3; continuous case	5
6. Concluding remarks	6

1. INTRODUCTION

For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, a sequence of real numbers $(a_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is said to be p -good pointwise if for any measure preserving flow $(U_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ on a probability space $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ and for any $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$, the averages $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(U_{a_k} x)$ converge almost everywhere.

Denote by Γ_p the set of p -good pointwise sequences and set $\Gamma = \Gamma_\infty$.

J. Bourgain proved in a series of papers (see [?] for the proof and further references) that polynomial sequences lie in Γ_p , for all $p > 1$. Bourgain, in fact, formulated his result for $\mathbb{Z}^d$ actions instead of $\mathbb{R}$ actions. To see the idea how we can translate the $\mathbb{Z}^d$ results to results on a flow, consider the example $f(x) = \sqrt{2}x^2 + x$. The transformation $T_{u,v} = U_{\sqrt{2}u+v}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ action,

Date: November 10, 2009.

and $U_{f(n)} = T_{n^2, n}$, hence Bourgain's result applied to T gives the result for the flow U_t .

For a simpler proof (in the case $p = 2$) of Bourgain's result, and for references see [?]. It is a famous open problem whether or not $(k^2) \in \Gamma_1$.

In the paper we prove the following two theorems. (Each can be viewed as a converse of J. Bourgain's result mentioned above).

Denote $\mathbb{R}^+ = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid r > 0\} = (0, \infty)$, and $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^+ = \{r \in \mathbb{R} \mid r \geq 0\} = [0, \infty)$.

Theorem A. *Let $f: \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real analytic function such that the set*

$$(1.1) \quad U = \{u > 0 : (f(ku))_{k \geq 1} \in \Gamma\}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_\infty,$$

is uncountable. Then $f(x)$ must be a polynomial.

Theorem B. *Let $U, V \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ be two non-empty open subsets. Let $f: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real continuous function such that $(f(ku + v))_{k \geq 1} \in \Gamma$, for all $u \in U, v \in V$. Then there exists a subinterval $J \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ (of positive length) such that f restricted to J is a polynomial.*

We remark that, in general, the conclusion of Theorem B cannot be that $f(x)$ agrees with a polynomial on a halfline, say. Indeed, we have

Proposition 1.1. *The function*

$$f(x) = \mathbf{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z}) = \min(x - [x], [x] + 1 - x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

satisfies the conditions of Theorem A with $U = V = \mathbb{R}^+$.

The above proposition shows that $f(x)$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem B (even with $U = V = \mathbb{R}^+$) may be a periodic non-constant function, so definitely not a polynomial on large subintervals of $\mathbb{R}^+$.

The claim of Proposition 1.1 follows from the results in [?].

Note that our proof of Theorem A depends on the fact that f is analytic at 0. (See Remark 2.1 in the next section).

The following result (first proved in [?]) plays a central role in the proofs of both theorems.

Lemma 1.2 ([?]). *Any sequence $(a_k) \in \Gamma$ must be linearly dependent over the field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational constants.*

For a simpler proof of this lemma (avoiding the use of Bourgain's entropy method) we refer the reader to [?].

2. PROOF OF THEOREM A

Proof of Theorem A. In view of Lemma 1.2, for every $x \in U$, there are an integer $n(x) \geq 1$ and an $n(x)$ -tuple of rationals

$$\mathbf{q}(x) = (q_1(x), \dots, q_{n(x)}(x)) \in \mathbb{Q}^{n(x)}, \quad q_{n(x)} = 1,$$

such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n(x)} q_k(x) f(kx) = 0.$$

Since the set of possible pairs $(n(x), \mathbf{q}(x))$ is countable while the set of $x \in U$ is uncountable, there is a pair $(n, \mathbf{q})$ corresponding to an uncountable set $U' \subset U$ of x :

$$(n(x), \mathbf{q}(x)) = (n, \mathbf{q}), \quad \text{for } x \in U'.$$

Since $f(x)$ is analytic, the identity

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n q_k f(kx) = 0, \quad q_n = 1,$$

extends (from $x \in U'$) to all $x \in [0, \infty)$ (the set U' being uncountable has an accumulation point).

Set $f(x) = \sum_{r \geq 0} c_r x^r$ to be the series expansion of f at 0. Then from the identity

$$0 = \sum_{k=1}^n q_k f(kx) = \sum_{r \geq 0} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n q_k k^r \right) c_r x^r$$

one deduces that, for all integers $r \geq 0$, either $c_r = 0$ or $\sum_{k=1}^n q_k k^r = 0$. It follows that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n q_k k^r = 0,$$

for all r in the set $K = \{r \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : c_r \neq 0\}$.

We observe that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k=1}^n q_k k^r = +\infty$$

(the last term $q_n n^r = n^r$ is dominant in the sum).

We conclude that the set $K = \{r \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : c_r \neq 0\}$ is finite, and $f(x)$ is a polynomial. $\square$

Remark 2.1. We don't know whether Theorem A holds if the domain of f is assumed to be $(0, \infty)$ rather than $[0, \infty)$. The recurrence relation (2.1) still holds in this setting. The conclusion of Theorem can be derived under the assumptions that f is analytic on $(0, \infty)$ and that either 0 or ∞ is an isolated singularity of the analytic extension of f .

3. PROOF OF THEOREM B

Proof of Theorem B. In view of Lemma 1.2, for every $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ there is an integer $n(u, v) \geq 1$ and an $n(u, v)$ -tuple of rationals

$$\mathbf{q}(u, v) = (q_1(u, v), q_2(u, v), \dots, q_{n(u, v)}(u, v)) \in \mathbb{Q}^{n(u, v)}, \quad \mathbf{q}(u, v) \neq \mathbf{0},$$

such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n q_k(u, v) f(ku + v) = 0.$$

For every integer $n \geq 1$ and an n -tuple of rationals $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, denote

$$K(n, \mathbf{q}) = \{(u, v) \in U \times V \mid n(u, v) = n \text{ and } \mathbf{q}(u, v) = \mathbf{q}\}.$$

Since $U \times V$ is a countable union of its closed subsets $K(n, \mathbf{q})$, by the Baire category theorem there is a choice of n and $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$, with not all $q_k = 0$, such that the set $K(n, \mathbf{q})$ contains a non-empty interior, say the set $U' \times V'$ where $U' \subset U$ and $V' \subset V$ are non-empty open subintervals of $(0, \infty)$. We conclude that

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n q_k f(ku + v) = 0, \quad \text{for } u \in U', v \in V'.$$

Definition 3.1. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open set, and let $X \subset U$ be a finite subset, $\text{card}(X) \geq 1$. Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be three functions such that f is continuous and g is injective. The quintuple (f, g, h, X, U) is called balanced if

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{x \in X} h(x) f(x + s + t g(x)) = 0,$$

provided that $|t|$ and $|s|$ are small enough.

Example 3.2. Let $U', V', n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ be such as described in the paragraph preceding (3.1). Pick $u_0 \in U', v_0 \in V'$ and let X be the set $X = \{x_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq n\}$ where $x_k = ku_0 + v_0$. Define $g, h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows: $g(x_k) = k$, $h(x_k) = q_k$. With these choices, it follows from (3.1) that the quintuple $(f, g, h, X, \mathbb{R}^+)$ is balanced.

Indeed, by setting $u = u_0 + t$ and $v = v_0 + s$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X} h(x) f(x + s + t g(x)) &= \sum_{k=1}^n h(x_k) f(x_k + s + t g(x_k)) = \sum_{k=1}^n q_k f(x_k + s + tk) = \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n q_k f(x_k + s + tk) = \sum_{k=1}^n q_k f((v_0 + s) + (u_0 + t)k) = \sum_{k=1}^n q_k f(v + uk) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $u \in U', v \in V'$ if both t, s are close to 0.

Now the claim of Theorem B follows from the following result.

Proposition 3.3. Let (f, g, h, X, U) be a balanced quintuple in the sense of Definition 3.1, with $\text{card}(X) = n \geq 1$. Let $x_0 \in X$ be such that $h(x_0) \neq 0$. Then $f(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq n - 2$ in a neighborhood of x_0 .

By definition, the zero constant is a polynomial of degree -1 . $\square$

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.3; SMOOTH CASE

Proof of Proposition 3.3; smooth case. First we provide proof under the additional assumption that $f \in C^\infty(U)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 \notin h(X)$. The proof is by induction on $n = \text{card}(X)$.

If $n = 1$, then by setting $t = 0$ we get $f(x_0 + s) = 0$, for all $|s|$ small enough, i. e. $f(x)$ vanishes in a neighborhood of x_0 . The case $n = 1$ is validated.

Next we assume that $n \geq 1$, that $X = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and that the claim of proposition is validated if $\text{card}(X) \leq n$. Observe that for an arbitrary real constant c a quintuple (f, g, h, X, U) is balanced if and only if a quintuple $(f, g + c, h, X, U)$ is. This is because $f(x + s + t g(x)) = f(x + s - ct + (g(x) + c)t)$, and the pair (s, t) is close to $(0, 0)$ (in the $\mathbb{R}^2$ metric) if and only if $(s - ct, t)$ is.

Thus we may assume that $g(x_n) = 0$ (after replacing $g(x)$ by $g(x) - g(x_n)$). Thus

$$0 = \sum_{x \in X} h(x) f(x + s + t g(x)) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} h(x_k) f(x_k + s + t g(x_k)) + h(x_n) f(x_n + s).$$

Taking the partial derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ we get

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} h(x_k) g(x_k) f'(x_k + s + t g(x_k)) = 0$$

and conclude that the quintuple $(f', g|_{X'}, hg|_{X'}, X', U)$ is balanced where $X' = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\} = X \setminus \{x_n\}$. Moreover, $g|_{X'}$ is injective, and $0 \notin hg(X')$.

By the induction hypothesis, for any $x' \in X'$, the derivative f' is a polynomial of degree $\leq n - 2$ in some neighborhood of x' . It follows that $f(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq n - 1 = (n + 1) - 2$ in a neighborhood of x_0 . This completes the proof of Proposition 3.3 under the added assumption that $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$. $\square$

5. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.3; CONTINUOUS CASE

Proof of Proposition 3.3; continuous case. Since (f, g, h, X, U) is a balanced quintuple, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that (3.2) holds provided that $|s|, |t| < \epsilon$. In the preceding section we proved that, under the additional condition that $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$, there exists a neighborhood W of a point x_0 such that $f|_W$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq n - 2$.

Our proof provides slightly more: This neighborhood W depends only on ϵ, g, h, X and U but not on $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$. The observation will be used in what follows.

Now we move to the general case of $f \in C(\mathbb{R}^+)$ (rather than $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$).

Fix any function $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(t) dt = 1$ and vanishes outside the interval $[-1, 1]$. For integers $m \geq 1$, denote

$$\phi_m(x) = m\phi(mx), \quad f_m(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\phi_m \circ f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_m(t)f(x-t) dt.$$

The sequence of kernels $\phi_m(x)$ is known to converge the δ -function at 0 in the sense that

$$(5.1) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} f_m(x) = f(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in U.$$

Note that all $f_m(x) \in C^\infty(U_m)$ where

$$U_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in U \mid \text{dist}(x, \partial U) > \frac{1}{m}\},$$

and $\text{dist}(x, \partial U)$ stands for the distance between x and the boundary of $U \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Let V be a neighborhood of the set X such that its closure $\overline{V}$ is compact and is contained in U . Then the pointwise convergence in (5.1) is uniform on V , and in fact $f_m \in C^\infty(V)$ holds for all m large enough. It is also clear that for m large enough, (f_m, g, h, X, V) forms a balanced quintuple because (f, g, h, X, V) does; moreover, there exists $\epsilon' > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{x \in X} h(x) f_m(x + s + tg(x)) = 0$$

holds simultaneously for all large m (say, $m > m_0$) and $s, t \in (-\epsilon', \epsilon')$. It follows that there exists a neighborhood $W \subset V$ of a point x_0 such that each function f_m is a polynomial of degree $\leq n-2$ in it. (Here we use the observation made in the second paragraph of this section). In view of the uniform convergence (5.1), $f|_W$ is also a polynomial of degree $\leq n-2$, completing the proof of Proposition 3.3. $\square$

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The following is a slightly more general version of Theorem A.

Theorem A'. *Let $(r_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence of distinct positive numbers, let $f: \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real analytic function such that the set*

$$(6.1) \quad U = \{u > 0 : (f(r_k u))_{k \geq 1} \in \Gamma\}, \quad \text{where } \Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_\infty,$$

is uncountable. Then $f(x)$ must be a polynomial.

The proof of Theorem A' is very similar to the proof of Theorem A.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON, TX 77005, USA
E-mail address: michael@rice.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS, 373 DUNN HALL, MEMPHIS, TN 38152-3240
E-mail address: mw@csi.hu